

c) depositing the material on the substrate at the second distance.

84. The method of claim 83, wherein the material is deposited by an electroless deposition technique.

85. The method of claim 83, wherein the first distance is between about 1 mm and about 5 mm.

86. The method of claim 83, wherein the second distance is between about 100 μ m or less.

87. The method of claim 83, further comprising applying a current to a surface of the substrate exposed to the electrolyte to deposit the material on the substrate at the first distance and the second distance.

88. The method of claim 87, wherein the current is applied of about 20 amps or less during deposition of the material.

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Restriction Requirement dated January 31, 2002, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on February 28, 2002. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-29, drawn to an apparatus for depositing and planarizing on a substrate, classified in class 216, subclass 38.
- II. Claims 30-88, drawn to a method for processing a substrate, classified in class 438, subclass 692.

The Examiner states that the inventions of Group I and II are distinct because the apparatus of the Group I invention could be made by processes materially different from

those of the Group II invention, for example, the material can be deposited by sputtering process instead of electro-chemical plating.

Applicants elect claims 1-29, Group I, with traverse. Claim 1 recites an apparatus for depositing and planarizing a material on a substrate using a substrate carrier movably disposed above a permeable disk. Claim 30 recites positioning a substrate at a first distance from a permeable disk and applying a current to deposit a material on the substrate, and positioning the substrate at a second distance from the permeable disk and applying a current to deposit the material on the substrate.

The Examiner errs in stating the apparatus of Group I could be made by processes material different from those on the Group II invention, since the apparatus of Group I are not deposited materials but rather apparatus for depositing and planarizing a material on a substrate. Thus, the Examiner fails to identify a materially different process that could make the apparatus, and therefore, the restriction is improper.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal or modification of the restriction requirement to permit prosecution of claims 1-88.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants